

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The technical consultants and some City staff reviewed and analyzed the design concepts discussed at the June Workshop and Task Force meeting. A composite framework (also referred to a “Core Plan”) proposed one combination of transit, creek, hydrology and parkway solutions.

The technical memoranda from the consultants and staff outline assumptions and criteria they employed in their analyses of the design concepts. These analyses are preliminary and general. More detailed analysis will occur later in the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) process.

The following criteria elaborate on ideas from the Task Force and community. Given the preliminary nature of the design concepts, not all of the following elements are included in the evaluation of the design concepts.

- 1. Technical feasibility** – this criterion should ensure that the elements of CVSP could be implemented in a manner consistent with prevailing and practical science, technology, and industry standards. Consultants will measure this feasibility based on their experience, professional judgment, recognized industry standards and literature. The CVSP is a practical, developable plan, and must be rooted to tried and trusted techniques.
- 2. Regulatory Feasibility** – several federal, state and local regulatory agencies maintain jurisdiction over various elements of the Core Plan, and should be consulted for input during the analyses of the plan.

The regulatory agencies include: The US Fish and Wildlife Service; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; CA Department of Fish and Game; US Army Corps of Engineers; US EPA, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Clara Valley Water District; Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; and Santa Clara County. It should be

noted that other agencies that would be contacted directly by City staff are not listed here.

The input of the regulatory agencies is vital for our feasibility assessment of the Plan. Factors to consider in our assessment include:

- a) Conformance with the requirements and objectives of the regulatory agencies
- b) Typical length of time needed to secure required permits and approvals
- c) Cost of permits and any mitigations that may be required
- d) Accessibility and flexibility of regulatory agencies
- e) Level of discretion enjoyed by local staff of regulatory agencies

3. Ecological Sustainability – CVSP should be designed to minimize waste, efficiently use its natural resources, and to manage and conserve them for use of the present and future generations. Factors to consider include:

- a) Maintain quality of air
- b) Maintain quality of water
- c) Conserve land, soil, water, energy as precious resources
- d) Maximize use of recycled water
- e) Conserve ecosystems - riparian corridors, fisheries, oak savannas, wetlands, etc.
- f) Use of Green Building principles to improve energy, water efficiency, and reduce consumption and waste.

4. Cost versus Value – This criterion generally relates to the provision of the various types of infrastructure (regional facilities like parks, open space, police/fire, schools, etc.; backbone infrastructure like streets, water, sewer, etc.; and in-tract infrastructure), and who will pay for it, recognizing that different types and densities of development place different burdens on infrastructure. Some factors to consider are:

- a) Oversizing of early infrastructure
- b) Financing techniques should correspond with types of infrastructure and service areas
- c) Facilities should be financed by all primary beneficiaries
- d) Financing contributions from various development types should correspond with demands placed on facilities

- e) Reimbursement mechanisms must account for early “oversizing by initial participants

5. Inertia/How does it start? – Factors to consider include:

- a) A phasing plan carefully choreographed with an infrastructure plan
- b) A starter strategy and financial feasibility
- c) Starter building typologies and their market viability

6. Developability/How does it grow? – Factors to consider include:

- a) An economically sound strategy for phasing the development of the various elements of the design concepts (transit, parkway system, focal lake, creek realignments, wetlands relocations, etc.)
- b) Review and permitting time of regulatory agencies should be considered
- c) Develop a synergistic growth sequence for different typologies, infrastructure, and public amenities

7. Risk – Dependence on what can't be controlled: This criterion aims to minimize risk. In this regard consultants should assess the degree to which typologies include:

- a) Opportunities for diverse job/employment base and not overly depend on a single industry
- b) High rises which contain a diversity of unit types for different family configurations and income levels
- c) Various housing types and tenancies

8. Social Equity – this criterion is meant to mitigate potential impacts a measure of the CVSP on social issues/services such as jobs, housing, education, health care and transportation. The following are some measures to consider in the Plan:

- a) Diversity of employment opportunities for all job sectors, and at all income levels
- b) Housing for all ages, ethnicities, family configurations and income groups
- c) Schools and educational facilities for all age groups
- d) Accessible health care

e) Convenient and affordable access to transportation facilities

9. Contribution to San Jose and Region: The CVSP should be a model for smart growth planning and development. If done right, it will bring visibility to San Jose and the region at large. Factors to consider in the analyses include:

- a) The CVSP includes at least 50,000 jobs. How would this contribute to employment and economic growth to San Jose and the region?
- b) The CVSP includes at least 25,000 residential units, twenty percent of which are designated as affordable. How will this affect the regional housing stock?
- c) The CVSP is charged with maintaining the Coyote Greenbelt as a non-urban buffer between the City of San Jose and Morgan Hill. How does maintenance of the Greenbelt impact San Jose and the Region in terms of open space preservation and trail connectivity across the valley?
- d) How will the CVSP contribute to San Jose's continuing efforts to achieve a balance of jobs and housing (given the fact that most employed residents in San Jose work outside the City)?
- e) Would CVSP jobs contribute to a reverse commute during commute hours, and therefore bring about better utilization of the transportation infrastructure?

10. Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes: These are the approved guidelines for preparing the CVSP, and they should be adhered to. A copy of these guidelines is attached (Attachment I), and can be obtained from the Coyote Valley Specific Plan website at www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/coyotevalley/. How do the design concepts address these guidelines?

11. Traffic impacts within and surrounding Coyote Valley: The City's intention is to minimize traffic impacts with Coyote Valley and surrounding communities. How do the following transportation elements address that intent?

- a) Future Caltrain station
- b) Coyote Valley transit system
- c) Parkway system
- d) An internal grid system linked to the parkway system on the perimeter of the site

- e) Trails connected to surrounding regional trail systems
- f) Construction of future interchanges with Highway 101
- g) Connections between the west and east sides of Monterey Road for vehicular, pedestrian, equestrian and possibly wildlife movement across the valley

12. Healthy lifestyle: This criterion should measure the degree to which the CVSP provides/promotes the following:

- a) Healthy, safe and attractive neighborhoods
- b) Parks and open space
- c) Community facilities (community centers, churches, etc.)
- d) Facilities for social events – plazas, squares, amphitheaters, etc.

13. Walkability:

- a) Tree lined streets
- b) Interconnected trails, and parks/recreation and open space systems
- c) Streets with detached sidewalk, and scaled to allow comfortable pedestrian circulation
- d) Transit stations that are within walking distances (no more than ½ mile) from residences and other destinations
- e) Traffic level of service and timed intersections that are not weighted in favor of the automobile

14. Equitable spread of costs and benefits – see Cost versus Value above